

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 10/018,795

REMARKS

Claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22, as amended, remain herein.

Claims 6 and 10 were amended in the Supplemental Amendment filed October 20, 2003, which was not referred to in the Office Action mailed on October 27, 2003, but should have been entered and should be considered in conjunction with this Amendment.

A corrective edit to claim 22 has been made: "W ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) is the channel length-width of the channel region and L (m) is the channel length of the channel region."

This Amendment places all claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 are respectfully requested.

1. Objections were stated to the drawings for not being sent to the Official Draftsperson. In a telephone discussion between applicants' representative, Robert N. Wieland and Examiner Hu on November 4, 2003, it was determined that Fig. 38

Serial No.: 10/018,795

was correctly filed with the August 8, 2003 Amendment, and that no further action regarding the drawings by applicants is required.

2. Claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 were subject to objections for a minor informality. Claims 4, 8-11, 15, 17, 21 and 22 have been amended to replace the words "disposed" and "located" with "respectively located."

Claims 10 and 22 have been amended to replace "W-Vlc" with "W\*Vlc."

3. Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kunii et al. U.S. Patent 5,412,493 and Yamazaki et al. U.S. Patent 6,218,219; claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kuni '493, Yamazaki '219 and Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA); and claims 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kunii '493, Yamazaki '219, AAPA and Ohta et al. U.S. Patent 6,532,053.

The presently claimed thin film transistor (TFT) has a single gate structure, as is apparent from the fact that the claims do not recite a multi-gate structure and applicants'

Serial No.: 10/018,795

specification and drawings provide no description of a multi-gate structure.

The Office Action cites Kunii '493 as allegedly disclosing the length of the LDD region  $\Delta L$  can be  $1\mu m$ , channel width and length can both be  $3\mu m$ , and the S-D voltage  $V_{lc}$  can be 5V. However, Kunii '493 discloses a TFT having a multi-gate structure, which is intrinsically different from the presently claimed TFT. A multi-gate TFT has the disadvantage of occupying a large area and has a decreased aperture rate. In contrast, the presently claimed TFT has a single gate structure and therefore is free of such drawbacks.

The Office Action admits that Kunii '493 does not disclose a 2 micron channel width and cites Yamazaki '219 as allegedly disclosing same. However, Yamazaki '219 does not provide the deficiencies of Kunii '493 described herein.

The Office Action admits that Kunii '493 and Yamazaki '219 do not disclose applicants' sheet resistance and cites AAPA as allegedly disclosing same. Also, the Office Action admits that Kunii '493, Yamazaki '219 and AAPA do not disclose a backlight, and cites Ohta '053 as allegedly disclosing same. However, none

Serial No.: 10/018,795

of Yamazaki '219, AAPA or Ohta '053 provides the deficiencies of Kunii '493 described herein.

For the foregoing reasons, none of Kunii '493, Yamazaki '219, AAPA or Ohta '053 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in any of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 6, which depends from claim 4, is allowable for the same reasons as claim 4 and claims 11, 15, 17, 21 and 22 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 4. Claims 9 and 10, which depend from claim 8, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 8. Claim 13, which depends from claim 11, is allowable for the same reasons as claim 11. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/018,795


All claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17, 21 and 22 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

February 9, 2004  
Date

  
Roger W. Parkhurst  
Registration No. 25,177  
Robert N. Wieland  
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:104

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.  
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805  
Telephone: (703) 739-0220